UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,972	10/30/2003	Carsten Sorensen	305537.01	8498

69316   7590   03/28/2011
MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052

EXAMINER
STRODER, CARRIE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3689	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/28/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DBOUTON@MICROSOFT.COM
vffiling@microsoft.com
stevensp@microsoft.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/696,972	SORENSEN, CARSTEN
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CARRIE A. STRODER	3689	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 January 2011</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,3-11,13-20,36 and 37</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,3-11,13-20,36 and 37</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ ~~Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)~~

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04 Mar 2011; 03 Feb 2011; 11 Nov 2010</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06) **Office Action Summary** Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20110314

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This is in response to the applicant's communication filed

on 27 January 2011, wherein:

   Claims 1, 3-11, 13-20, and 36-37 are currently pending;

   claims 1, 11, and 13 are currently amended;

   claims 2, 12, and 21-35 are cancelled; and

   claims 36-37 are new.

Information Disclosure Statement

1.   The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 04

March 2011, 03 February 2011, and 11 November 2010 are in

compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97.   Accordingly, the

information disclosure statements are being considered by the

examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which

forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this

Office action:

   (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically
   disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the
   differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior
   art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at
   the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the
   art to which said subject matter pertains.   Patentability shall not be
   negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   **Claims 1-6, 8-12, 15, and 19-20 are rejected under 35
U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hajmiragha (US
6289460), in view of Beran et al. (US 20020055888).**

     Referring to claim 1:

     Hajmiragha teaches

     using the processor at the replier to access an index by
executing processor instructions, wherein the index is stored in
a first data store on a remotely located computer storage media,
the first data store being remote from the replier, the index
having one entry for each of a plurality of documents, each
entry including index information related to the document with
which it is associated, each of the documents being generated by
a document generator that is resident at one of a plurality of
requesters and each of the documents being stored at one of a
plurality of data stores remotely located form the first data
store (col. 2, line 50 thru col. 3, line 28 & col. 7, lines 11-
21 & col. 10, lines 16-19 & Fig. 2; "the document manager allows
search against the content of a document as well as the document
attributes" implies each entry includes index information
related to one of the documents and "…the remote storage
includes multiple distributed remotely located storage
components…" and the index is stored at 50 as shown in Fig. 2,

which is remote from the user 22 and it is implied that an
external document is generated by a user on their computer
system and where external documents, once generated and
identified for use by the system, are stored on an "external
document repository 122" also shown in Fig. 2) and wherein the
index information for each entry in the index is provided to the
index by the RFQ generator that generated the RFQ and stored the
RFQ at one of the plurality of data stores remotely located from
the first data store with which the entry is associated (col. 5,
line 1 thru col. 6, line 8 and col. 7, lines 10-21 and Figs. 1-
2; "An external document is a document not residing with the
document manager 21." and "…the user appoints a target directory
for the file" and where it is understood that when saving a
document, a user may choose to save it at the client computer 22
or at external document repository 122, which are remote
locations from the index 50 and receiving the document to the
system is interpreted as receiving indexing information for the
document and it is implied that an external document is
generated by a user on their computer system 22 and further,
"indexing" is merely describing the type of information being
provided and therefore, does not distinguish over the prior art)

       using the processor at the replier to identify a document
for reply, by filtering entries in the index of documents based

on supplier filter criteria to create a subset of entries that

meet the supplier filter criteria and selecting an entry in the

index from the subset of entries, including identifying, from

information in the selected index entry, a second data store in

which the identified document is stored from one of the

plurality remotely located data stores (col. 10, lines 16-19 &

col. 7, lines 11-21 & Fig. 2; where it is implied that, once the

user searches and/or filters the documents, the user selects a

document, which they then open from its stored location, which

requires that the location of the document is given [else, what

is the point of searching for a document?] and Fig. 2 shows that

the user is using their browser on their computer at 22, which

involves the use of the processor at the replier);

    using the processor to retrieve the identified document

from the second data store (col. 5, lines 1-14; "users allow

other interested parties access to read-only archived documents

while maintaining security and control"); and

    using the processor to generate a reply to the retrieved

document by providing information requested in the retrieved

document (col. 7, lines 33-50; "For example, John Smith is

requested to review, or sign, a given document by a specific

date. Each registered user requested to perform an action

against a document is informed of the request by an e-mail

containing the request and a link to the document's location").

Hajmiragha discloses a document management system.

Hajmiragha does not disclose where the document is an RFQ.

However, Beran teaches a similar system that handles

documents for requisitioning goods and services. Beran teaches

where the document is an RFQ (paragraph 27; "As shown in FIG. 4,

a requisitioner first enters request document data on an HTML

header page that has been provided to the user/requisitioner

400. The software enabling the entry of request document data is

part of the agency requisitioner module 208. The request

document header data for entry preferably includes a reference

number for the request document and a confirming number").

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill

in the art (PHOSITA) at the time of invention to modify

the system disclosed in Hajmiragha to incorporate where the

document is an RFQ as taught by Beran because this would

provide a manner for directing the type of document, thus aiding

the client by providing the desired information.

Referring to claim 3:

Hajmiragha discloses after retrieving the document, using

the processor to apply detailed supplier filter criteria to the

retrieved document based on a content of the retrieved document
(col. 10, lines 16-22).

Referring to claim 4:

Beran teaches generating a reply to the retrieved document
only if it meets the detailed supplier filter criteria
(paragraphs 57 and 60; "The system then filters the set of
vendors according to their profiles and the basic NIGP code
specified in the RFXs to determine the subset of vendors that
will receive a notification regarding a particular RFX 610." and
"First, with the receipt of the e-mail notification, the vendor
completes a response data page 700. Preferably, this page
prompts the vendor to enter a price for the goods or services
requested and any comment that the vendor desires to include
regarding any desired transaction terms. Once the response page
is completed, the vendor can submit the data as its bid.").

Referring to claim 5:

Beran teaches using the processor to transmit the reply to
the requester that generated the retrieved document (paragraph
61; "The buyer has the option of viewing the vendor responses,
including vendor line item instructions and comments, scanning
the database for the award history corresponding to a particular

vendor that responded, and sending a personalized e-mail to a

vendor contact.").

     Referring to claim 6:

     Hajmiragha discloses

     generating the reply comprises accessing the content of the

retrieved document (col. 6, lines 37-59; where "review" implies

that the content of the RFQ is accessed);

     and generating the reply based on the content of the

document (col. 6, lines 37-59; where "approval" and

"collaboration" imply that the reply is based upon the contents

of the document).

     Referring to claim 8:

     Hajmiragha discloses accessing the index over a global

computer network (col. 2, lines 51-55; where "internet" is

interpreted as a global computer network).

     Referring to claim 9:

     Hajmiragha discloses retrieving the identified document

from the data store at the requester over a global computer

network (col. 5, lines 1-14).

Referring to claim 10:

Beran teaches

prior to accessing the index, using the processor to provide supplier registration information to a registration component (paragraph 16; "The software system implementation includes an agency registration module 200, a vendor registration module 202, a login module 204, an agency system administrator module 206, an agency requisitioner module 208, an agency buyer module 210, an agency approver module 212, a vendor access module 214 and a batch module 216."); and

using the processor to download a reply engine, the reply engine accessing the index (paragraph 60; where it is inherent in using the "response data page" that the information be downloaded).

Referring to claim 11:

Hajmiragha discloses

using the processor to save the document at a predetermined location in a data store local to a computer system at the requester, such that the document is exposed for downloading to a supplier for generation of a reply (col. 5, line 61 thru col. 6, line 8 and col. 7, lines 10-21; "Document publication is the

process by which a user extracts a copy of the document" and
"Then, the user appoints a target directory for the file" and
"The external document is indexed once and access to the
external document is managed by the document manager 21 using
the Access Control List facilities." and where the user may save
the document in a local data store and then designate the
document as an external document, such that it would then be
available for downloading and further, *such that the document is
exposed for downloading to a supplier for generation of a reply*
is not a positive claim limitation and therefore, receives
little patentable weight); and

     using the processor to send indexing information related to
the document to an index remote from the computer system of the
requester when the document is saved at the data store local to
the requestor without prompting from the remote index, wherein
the remote index is accessible by one or more supplier computer
systems, wherein each index entry identifies a document for
which the requestor thereof solicits a response, and wherein the
indexing information identifies the data store where the
document is stored (col. 7, lines 10-21; "The external document
is indexed…" and "…access speed to documents externally stored
in a repository...").

Hajmiragha discloses a document management system.
Hajmiragha does not disclose providing supplier registration
information from the requester to a registration component and
downloading an RFQ generation engine to the requester, after the
RFQ engine is downloaded to the requester, using the RFQ
generation engine at the requester to enter the job information
into a predetermined RFQ template, and where a document is an
RFQ template and entering the job information into a
predetermined RFQ template.

However, Beran teaches a similar system that handles
documents for requisitioning goods and services. Beran teaches

providing supplier registration information from the
requester to a registration component and downloading an RFQ
generation engine to the requester (paragraphs 16 and 22-26;
"The software system implementation includes an agency
registration module 200, a vendor registration module 202, a
login module 204, an agency system administrator module 206, an
agency requisitioner module 208, an agency buyer module 210, an
agency approver module 212, a vendor access module 214 and a
batch module 216." and where it is inherent in using the "HTML
header page" that the information be downloaded);

after the RFQ engine is downloaded to the requester, using
the RFQ generation engine at the requester to enter the job

information into a predetermined RFQ template (paragraphs 22-27;

paragraph 27; "As shown in FIG. 4, a requisitioner first enters

request document data on an HTML header page that has been

provided to the user/requisitioner 400. The software enabling

the entry of request document data is part of the agency

requisitioner module 208. The request document header data for

entry preferably includes a reference number for the request

document and a confirming number" and where the "HTML header

page" is interpreted as a template); and

    where the document is an RFQ template (paragraph 27; "As

shown in FIG. 4, a requisitioner first enters request document

data on an HTML header page that has been provided to the

user/requisitioner 400. The software enabling the entry of

request document data is part of the agency requisitioner module

208. The request document header data for entry preferably

includes a reference number for the request document and a

confirming number" and where the "HTML header page" is

interpreted as a template).

    It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill

in the art (PHOSITA) at the time of invention to modify

the system disclosed in Hajmiragha to incorporate providing

supplier registration information from the requester to a

registration component and downloading an RFQ generation engine

to the requester, after the RFQ engine is downloaded to the
requester, using the RFQ generation engine at the requester to
enter the job information into a predetermined RFQ template, and
where a document is an RFQ template and entering the job
information into a predetermined RFQ template as taught by Beran
because this would provide a manner for directing what the
replies to the RFQ's should include, thus aiding the client by
providing the desired information.

Referring to claim 13:

Hajmiragha discloses

entering the job information into a predetermined document
template, wherein entering the job information comprises:
entering requester filter criteria indicative of suppliers
authorized to reply to the document template (col. 7, lines 33-
54; "A set of process flow templates are used during the Access
Control List definition process." and "During Access Control
List definition, a document acquires the following attributes:
Users allowed access to the document…");

using the processor to save the document at a predetermined
location in a data store local to a computer system at the
requester, such that the document is exposed for downloading to
a supplier for generation of a reply (col. 5, line 61 thru col.

6, line 8 and col. 7, lines 10-21; "Document publication is the process by which a user extracts a copy of the document" and "Then, the user appoints a target directory for the file" and "The external document is indexed once and access to the external document is managed by the document manager 21 using the Access Control List facilities." and where the user may save the document in a local data store and then designate the document as an external document, such that it would then be available for downloading and further, *such that the document is exposed for downloading to a supplier for generation of a reply* is not a positive claim limitation and therefore, receives little patentable weight); and

using the processor to send indexing information related to the document to an index remote from the computer system of the requester when the document is saved at the data store local to the requestor without prompting from the remote index, wherein the remote index is accessible by one or more supplier computer systems, wherein each index entry identifies a document for which the requestor thereof solicits a response, and wherein the indexing information identifies the data store where the document is stored (col. 7, lines 10-21; "The external document is indexed…" and "…access speed to documents externally stored in a repository...").

Hajmiragha discloses a document management system.
Hajmiragha does not disclose where the document is an RFQ
template.

However, Beran teaches a similar system that handles
documents for requisitioning goods and services. Beran teaches
where the document is an RFQ template (paragraph 27; "As shown
in FIG. 4, a requisitioner first enters request document data on
an HTML header page that has been provided to the
user/requisitioner 400. The software enabling the entry of
request document data is part of the agency requisitioner module
208. The request document header data for entry preferably
includes a reference number for the request document and a
confirming number" and where the "HTML header page" is
interpreted as a template).

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill
in the art (PHOSITA) at the time of invention to modify
the system disclosed in Hajmiragha to incorporate where the
document is an RFQ template as taught by Beran because this
would provide a manner for directing the type of document, thus
aiding the client by providing the desired information.

Referring to claims 14:

Hajmiragha discloses sending requester filter criteria indicative of suppliers authorized to reply to the document (col. 7, lines 33-54; "A set of process flow templates are used during the Access Control List definition process." and "During Access Control List definition, a document acquires the following attributes: Users allowed access to the document…").

Referring to claim 15:

Beran teaches receiving a reply to the document from a supplier (paragraph 60; "…the vendor can submit the data as its bid").

Referring to claim 19:

Hajmiragha discloses

using the processor to receive indexing information for each document from the requester without prompting from the requester, the indexing information being provided by an document generator at the requester that generated the document and being indicative of the document stored at a requester data store local to a computer system at the requester (col. 5, line 1 thru col. 6, line 8 and col. 7, lines 10-21 and Figs. 1-2; "An external document is a document not residing with the document

manager 21." and "…the user appoints a target directory for the file" and where it is understood that when saving a document, a user may choose to save it at the client computer and receiving the document to the system is interpreted as receiving indexing information for the document and it is implied that an external document is generated by a user on their computer system 22 and further, "indexing" is merely describing the type of information being provided and therefore, does not distinguish over the prior art); and

using the processor to enter an entry in the index by executing instructions with the processor in a data store on a computer storage media remote from the requester computer system for each document based on the index information, the entry being indicative of a category of a corresponding document on the requester data store, the index being exposed to access by suppliers (col. 7, lines 10-21 and col. 6, lines 9-19 and Fig. 1; "An external document is a document not residing with the document manager 21. The external document is indexed once and access to the external document is managed by the document manager 21 using the Assess Control List facilities." and where "content indexing" is interpreted to include an entry indicative of a category of a corresponding RFQ).

Hajmiragha discloses a document management system.
Hajmiragha does not disclose where the document is an RFQ.

However, Beran teaches a similar system that handles
documents for requisitioning goods and services. Beran teaches
where the document is an RFQ (paragraph 22).

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill
in the art (PHOSITA) at the time of invention to modify
the system disclosed in Hajmiragha to incorporate where a
document is an RFQ as taught by Beran because this would
provide a manner for directing what the replies to the RFQ's
should include, thus aiding the client by providing the desired
information.

Referring to claim 20:

Hajmiragha discloses for each entry in the index, including
filter criteria accessible by the suppliers to identify
documents for reply (col. 10, lines 16-22).

As above, Beran teaches where the document is an RFQ
(paragraph 22).

Further, "to identify RFQs for reply" is a statement of
intended use. Statements of intended use do not limit the scope
of a claim or claim limitation. See MPEP 2106.

Referring to claim 36:

Hajmiragha discloses entering requester filter criteria indicative of suppliers authorized to reply to the document template (col. 7, lines 33-62 and col. 10, lines 16-28; "…a document acquires the following attributes: users allowed access to the document…" and "All document accesses are granted by the owner of the document.").

Beran teaches where the document is an RFQ (paragraph 22).

Referring to claim 37:

Hajmiragha discloses sending requester filter criteria indicative of suppliers authorized to reply to the document template (col. 7, lines 33-62 and col. 10, lines 16-28; "…a document acquires the following attributes: users allowed access to the document…" and "All document accesses are granted by the owner of the document.").

As above, Beran teaches where the document is an RFQ (paragraph 22).

3. **Claims 7 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hajmiragha (US 6289460) in view of Beran et al. (US 20020055888), and further in view of Heimermann et al. (US 7110976).**

Referring to claim 7:

Hajmiragha discloses a document management system. Beran
teaches a similar system that handles documents for
requisitioning goods and services. Hajmiragha and Beran do not
teach automatically generating the reply based on the content of
the RFQ.

However Heimermann teaches a similar system which handles
documents for requisitioning goods and services. Heimermann
teaches automatically generating the reply based on the content
of the RFQ (paragraphs 181-182).

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill
in the art (PHOSITA) at the time of invention to modify the
teachings of Hajmiragha and Beran as taught by Heimermann
because this provides a more cost effective supplier sourcing
system.

Referring to claims 16:

Heimermann teaches entering award criteria indicative of
criteria considered in awarding a job corresponding to the RFQ
to a supplier (paragraph 183).

Referring to claim 17:

Heimermann teaches

evaluating the received reply based on the award criteria
(paragraph 183); and

suggesting a winning supplier based on the evaluation of
the award criteria (paragraph 183).

Referring to claim 18:

Heimermann teaches weighting the award criteria according
to a predetermined weight (paragraph 183; the system primarily
makes awards based on price, but also "factors in" other
considerations, which necessarily requires assigning a
predetermined weight to the considerations).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 27 January 2011 have been fully
considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 112

    Considering the amendments made and Fig. 3, newly cited by
applicant to show that the RFQ generator is at the requester,
the rejections are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103

    In regards to claim 1, applicant argues that the prior art
references do not disclose that the index is stored in a first
data store on a remotely located computer storage media, the
first data store being remote from the replier. Examiner
respectfully disagrees. Hajmiragha shows the index 50, in Fig.
2, as remotely located from the user 22.

    Applicant also argues that the prior art does not teach
"each of the RFQs being generated by an RFQ generator that is
resident at one of a plurality of requesters." Examiner
respectfully disagrees. The document generator is inherently
taught by provision of a document to the system (see col. 7,
lines 11-21). It is implied, since this is a common way to
create documents, that the user creates a document on their
computer system 22.

    Applicant also argues that the prior art does not disclose
"each of the RFQs being stored at one of a plurality of data

stores remotely located from the first data store." Examiner
respectfully disagrees. Hajmiragha states, in col. 7, lines 10-
21, "An external document is a document not residing with the
document manager 21." and shows documents stored at external
document repository 122, which are remote locations from the
index 50.

    Additionally, applicant argues that the prior art does not
teach, "selecting an entry in the index from the subset of
entries." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Hajmiragha
discloses, in col. 10, lines 16-19 a searching and filtering
capability and it is implied that, once the user searches and/or
filters the documents, the user selects a document, which they
then open from its stored location [else, what is the point of
searching for a document?].

    In regards to claim 11, applicant argues that Hajmiragha
does not teach that a computer system at a requester generates
and stores an RFQ in a local data store. Examiner respectfully
disagrees. Examiner emphasizes that the claim language states
that the index is remote from the requestor. Fig. 1 of
Hajmiragha shows that the Document Manager 21 is remote from the
client 22. Hajmiragha states that an external document is
indexed and managed by the document manager 21. Since the

document is an 'external' document, it is understood that the
document is saved remotely to the document manager, or local to
the requestor (in this case, the client computer 22).

    In regards to claim 19, applicant argues that the prior art
does not teach "the indexing information being provided by an
RFQ generator at the requester that generated the RFQ."
Examiner respectfully disagrees. Hajmiragha states, in col. 5,
line 1 thru col. 6, line 8 that documents are provided to the
system and receiving the document to the system for indexing is
interpreted as receiving indexing information for the document.
For example, information regarding at least the location of the
document must be provided to the system.

    Applicant also argues that the prior art does not teach
"the RFQ stored at a requester data store local to a computer
system." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Hajmiragha states,
in col. 5, line 1 thru col. 6, line 8 that "…the user appoints a
target directory for the file" and where it is understood that
when saving a document, a user may choose to save it at the
client computer 22.

In regards to claim 13, it is almost completely re-written and as such, applicant made no arguments in their remarks regarding it.

Conclusion

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CARRIE A. STRODER whose telephone number is (571)270-7119. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jan Mooneyham can be reached on (571)272-6805. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CARRIE A. STRODER/
Examiner, Art Unit 3689

/Janice A. Mooneyham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3689